DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 222 680 CE 034 052

AUTHOR Newman, Anabel; Huffman, Ruth E.
TITLE Collection, Evaluation, Dissemination System (CEDS). An Index of 309/310 Adult Basic Education Projects, Indiana 1976-1981. Final Report.
INSTITUTION Indiana Univ., Bloomington. School of Education.
SPONS AGENCY Indiana State Dept. of Public Instruction, Indianapolis. Div. of Adult and Community Education.
PUB DATE 82
NOTE 39p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Basic Education; Adult Educators; Adult Programs; *Demonstration Programs; Diffusion (Communication); *Educational Innovation; *Information Dissemination; Program Evaluation; *Teacher Education
IDENTIFIERS 310 Project; Indiana

ABSTRACT

The purpose of the CEDS project was to assist funded resource centers in the collection and review of completed adult basic education special projects in Indiana. Successful special projects for 1976-81 that resulted in publication of products were identified by applying criteria presented in three instruments. Product reports were then obtained and judged as to suitability for dissemination by electronic means, hands-on experience, workshops, or other dissemination media. An index of special projects was printed and disseminated. Each of the 24 projects was analyzed, and appropriate marketing strategies were recommended. A needs-analysis questionnaire was also administered to approximately 100 adult basic education personnel to identify the appropriate audience for the special projects. The Indiana University SUVON line and microcomputers located throughout Indiana were identified as suitable for use in a statewide communication network. It was concluded that efforts to disseminate products and to diffuse innovations should be intensified, specifications for final products should be formulated, copies of 310 products should be readily available, project evaluations should be more informative, and project publications should be disseminated. Appendixes include the instruments, questionnaires and list of the special projects. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED222680

FINAL REPORT OF

COLLECTION, EVALUATION, DISSEMINATION SYSTEM
(CEDS)

FY-82-8074-P

AN INDEX OF 309/310 ADULT BASIC EDUCATION PROJECTS INDIANA 1976-1981

a special demonstration/teacher training project
funded by a grant from the
Indiana Department of Public Instruction
Division of Adult and Community Education

under Section 310 of the Adult Education Act, P.L. 91-230 as amended

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

Dr. Anabel Newman
Ruth E. Huffman

CE 034052

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

L Zeiler

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U.S. Department of Education. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U.S. Department of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Department of Education should be inferred.

ABSTRACT

The COLLECTION, EVALUATION, DISSEMINATION SYSTEM (CEDS) was a 310 project funded to assist resource centers in Indiana in the collection and review of completed special projects to determine the most appropriate means of dissemination, i.e., electronic media, workshops, or other effective methods of dissemination.

The objectives specified in order to meet the intended purpose of the CEDS Project were:

Identify successful special projects.

Collect special projects for dissemination.

Provide a printed index of special projects.

Recommend appropriate marketing strategies.

Identify appropriate audience for receipt of SPs.

Identify electronic and other resources available for use in statewide communication network.

The products of the project include:

1) a map of the State of Indiana outlining all of the possibilities for telecommunication linkage in Indiana
2) a chart listing the projects with possible marketing recommendations.
3) an evaluation instrument for evaluating special projects.
4) a needs analysis questionnaire related to special projects.
5) a final report addressing the objectives and discussing the process of collection, evaluation, and dissemination via the most appropriate vehicle, and the feasibility of linking local programs with electronic communication networks throughout the State of Indiana as well as possibilities for linking with other states.
6) the ABE Index of Special Projects, describing, analyzing and evaluating the twenty-four Special Projects funded during 1978-1981 in Indiana.

Information concerning the Design, Procedures, Results, Recommendations and Conclusions as determined by the CEDS staff are relevant to adult basic education teachers, public and private agencies concerned with adult education, and adult administrators and support staff.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people contributed to the development of the CEDS project. It would be impossible to acknowledge them all, but certain ones deserve special mention.

To Mary G. Williams, Linda Zeiler, and Dr. Tim Wells of the Division of Adult Education, Department of Public Instruction, State of Indiana, who provided much help and encouragement.

To Indiana University and the School of Education -- especially Dr. Leo Fay, Chairman of Language Education; Dr. Rick Pugh, Associate Dean for Research and Development; and our authorities in budget matters, Ray Martin and Ethyl Workman in the Contracts Administration Office.

To Rolla F. Pruett, Division of West Central Joint Services, for sharing facilities at the Indianapolis project site.

To the members of the Baker Adult Education Center, Indianapolis -- especially Mrs. Dorothy Toon who served as Indianapolis secretary for the project.

To the Institute for Child Study for use of their facilities; and the Reading Practicum Center, located in the Institute, whose library, resources (specifically Joyce Melton, Anita Benna, and Hope Elkins), and professional staff have been of great help -- particularly Lois Webster who coordinated the Bloomington CEDS activities, wrote initial drafts of index entries, typed the index, and provided constant good judgment; Tony Abplanalp and Keith Meilke who handled computer considerations; and Mike Monar for assistance in the final production.

In addition, we wish to express appreciation to Dr. Edward Robbins and Deborah Bonnet for helping with evaluations at crucial points; to Carol Szatkowski for typing and guarding the accounts in Bloomington; to Philip Newman who assisted in the proposal and final product stages; and to many others in the field dedicated to making Adult Basic Education effective.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract..... iii

Introduction..... 1

Design/Procedure/Results..... 3

Conclusions/Recommendations..... 14

Appendices..... 22

A
B
C
D

INTRODUCTION

There is currently no statewide program for disseminating completed adult basic education special projects that has proven successful in Indiana. Since 1976 twenty-four 309/310 projects provided under the U.S. Adult Education Act have been funded. However, except where dissemination was part of the project proposal or was conducted by Indiana's Department of Public Instruction (DPI) through its regular meetings with adult basic education directors, no systematic distribution of these projects has occurred. Consequently, many excellent projects are on the shelves, or are being used in a limited way. In northern Indiana, an active resource center has been providing service training and incorporating the use of 310 projects. In 1981, a resource center was established in Indianapolis to further pursue the dissemination of special projects. A needs analysis administered for this project reveals that many adult educators are still unacquainted with the store of materials available for use in their programs.

The purpose of the project, COLLECTION, EVALUATION, and DISSEMINATION SYSTEM (CEDS) was to assist funded resource centers in the collection and review of completed special projects to determine the most appropriate means of dissemination, i.e., electronic media, workshops, or other effective methods of dissemination. A printed index of projects was to be developed along with appropriate marketing strategies. Audiences were to be identified for receipt of the projects' results. The feasibility of linking local programs with electronic communication networks was to be explored.

The objectives specified in order to meet the intended purpose of the CEDS Project were:

- Identify successful special projects.
- Collect special projects for dissemination.
- Provide a printed index of special projects.
- Recommend appropriate marketing strategies.
- Identify appropriate audience for receipt of SPs.
- Identify electronic and other resources available for use in statewide communication network.

Other background information is included in the Index developed by the CEDS Project.

DESIGN/PROCEDURE/RESULTS

This section deals with the design, the advance plan or structure, the procedures (how the project was conducted in order to meet stated objectives), and the results of the project. These three sections are combined for reader ease.

Given the strong need within the state for adequate and appropriate dissemination of 310 projects, the project directors designed the objectives below. We feel that three needs impelled our work. The first need, i.e., to assist local personnel in decision-making regarding use of the products could be met through an index of all the products. The second need, to recommend state and national dissemination plans for each project, we proposed to provide through a collection of marketing strategies. The third need, providing useful data for decision-making at the state level, we have set forth in the section of this report, "Conclusions and Recommendations."

Expected Outcomes

Objective 1. Identify successful Special Projects (SPs)

The identification of successful special projects for 1976-1981 was accomplished with assistance from the staff at the Department of Public Instruction (DPI), Division of Adult & Community Education, and by direct contact with all developers, directors and adult education personnel associated with the development or use of special projects. Letters, telephone calls, and individual contacts enabled us to collect copies of the available products and final reports. "Successful" at this stage was defined as a completed project with some identifiable product. As the development of the index progressed, "successful" was further defined by the evaluation criteria applied to each product. (See Appendix A for evaluation instruments developed by the CEDS staff.) A team from the CEDS project staff examined each project final report in terms of how clearly objectives and purposes were stated and how well it appeared these objectives and purposes

were reflected in the final product. It is our intent that readers may now use the evaluation criteria themselves to further accomplish their own evaluation for local needs.

RESULTS: Objective accomplished. All products and available final reports were identified despite enumerable difficulties. Evaluating the merits of 310 products was the more difficult step in achieving the objective. The success of each project was judged by applying criteria presented in the three instruments shown in the Appendix. We have included all three instruments to show the evolution of our thinking as to how best to accomplish the evaluation process.. We were obviously limited in knowing how products performed in the field, since our information for judging effectiveness was limited to the products themselves and developer-supplied evaluation findings, which rarely addressed all pertinent questions. Likewise, in answering the question of cost-effectiveness as to the time, resources, and money available at individual sites, we were limited to our own judgment since this information was often unavailable. Several attempts to develop a set of evaluation criteria that would cover all bases helped clarify our thinking, but none of the evaluation instruments worked equally well for all of the projects. Criteria which made sense for a research study did not apply to innovative curriculum, and vice-versa. Even beyond the problem of applicability, it soon became apparent that the adopting site must make the decision on what projects they considered "successful" based on their facilities, equipment, personnel, materials already available compared to what would be needed to implement the program of a particular project. These were variables that we could not determine at this stage of the process.

Stepping back and focusing on the purposes of evaluating the products resulted in our final solution. We clarified our role to be: "We have collected all products and available final reports, have evaluated them to the best of our ability, and have reported our findings in detail in order that local personnel and DPI staff may have the facts to decide what, if anything, to do with them."

Objective 2.1. Collect Sps for dissemination.

The available Sps were first collected at the Baker Center where the co-director reviewed and catalogued them according to the order in which they were received. Later each product was given the letter assigned according to an alphabetical listing of developer names. (See Appendix B). Bloomington personnel then reviewed, developed the index entries, and identified those suitable for dissemination by electronic means, hands-on experience, workshops or through other dissemination media. (See "Marketing Strategies" in Index.)

RESULTS: Objective partially accomplished. In spite of intense and extended efforts, the CEDS staff was unable to obtain even single copies of some parts of the original products reports, while locating many others was a laborious task. In a few instances, copies of the Sps no longer available for distribution were previewed at DPI or borrowed from developers or the resource center in Indianapolis, thus providing at least a preview of the material; however, even with this approach, some of the products were not visible, nor did the CEDS staff obtain the products verified in the final report as having been completed. If our staff, paid to accomplish this task, became frustrated and discouraged trying to retrieve all of the renegade pieces, think how the beleagured adult basic education teacher might feel when faced with the same task!

Objective 2.2. Provide printed index of Sps.

Concurrent with the collection and review of the project reports and products at Bloomington and the Baker Center, a special study was made to determine the content, format, and the intent of the printed index. It was determined that the individual project index should provide a description of the product, the intent/purpose, obtainability, cost, implementation procedures, contact person, and an evaluation of the project and product. The initial contents of each index entry were then written by the CEDS staff, reviewed by each project developer concerned, and then revised again by the CEDS staff, incorporating changes, suggestions, and corrections made by the project reviewer. As each working draft of the proposed index format was completed, it was also shared with members of DPI staff and the Dissemination Training Coordinating Committee.* After all concerned parties reviewed and made suggestions as to corrections, index entries were then given a final editing and typing by the CEDS staff. These steps, coupled with the review and study of each final report, identified information needed to fill in the missing sections of the index entries.

As each index entry was completed, two experienced computer programmers assisted with the development of the "Computer Considerations" sections of the Index, as well as the "Marketing Strategies Matrix." Initially, Computer Programmer Number One read through all of the final reports of the projects/products. He would then develop the "Computerization, alternatives to computerization, recommendations and notes.

RESULTS: Objective Accomplished. Fifty (50) copies of the ABE/Index were printed for DPI to disseminate to interested ABE personnel. Additional copies were printed and will be distributed to appropriate and interested persons, agencies, and out-of-state service organizations associated with

* The Dissemination Training Coordinating Committee was a committee appointed by DPI staff to coordinate and monitor 310 projects. The committee was composed of members of DPI staff, the directors of two resource centers, and other current 310 project directors. The committee members met periodically to monitor the progress of the current projects.

literacy and adult education. The Index contains five sections:

Introduction
Products and Descriptors
Index of 309/310 Projects, 1976-1981
Marketing Strategies
Appendix (includes evaluation forms, needs analysis questionnaire, maps with information concerning adult education in Indiana)

As a note for future project directors, however, it proved to be more difficult and time consuming than it ought to be to find basic facts about the project. The information was also often confusing and difficult to read. On some reports, the CEDS staff spent at least two hours minimum trying to determine the purpose and proposal objectives.

Objective 2.3. Recommend appropriate marketing strategies for SPs.

The appropriateness for various audiences of any given project was reviewed by the CEDS staff, an outside evaluator (Deborah Bonnet, Bonnet & Phelps Associates), and by computer analysts from Indiana University. Since no two 310 SPs are alike, this step was time consuming and required expert judgment. Each of the twenty-four (24) individual projects was analyzed against specific criteria such as original purpose, intent, operation, population served, appropriate settings or intended audience, and outcomes, i.e., Was there a product to market--or was it a research report? As previously mentioned in this report, the recommended marketing strategies may be found in the CEDS Index (p. 123).

RESULTS: Objective accomplished. Marketing and computer specialists and other members of the CEDS staff recommended a wide variety of marketing strategies. Although these recommendations were originally to be included in each index write-up, it was decided to present all of the recommendations on our matrix for ease of reference, especially for DPI. As may be seen by the matrix (Index, p.123), circled entries identify the most recommended strategy for disseminating each project.

The marketing strategies matrix also shows that, in the CEDS' staff opinions, almost all SPs should be stocked at the resource centers. This will involve effort and expense, but if the expense of the CEDS project is to be justified, these projects must be available for examination by prospective users.

The following factors were considered in our recommendations for disseminating the projects' products:

- The clarity of the project's intent.
- The breadth and intensity of the state's (and nation's) need for the innovation at this point in time.
- The strength of available evidence that the innovation would fulfill that need in programs other than where it was developed.
- The cost and feasibility of replicating the innovation statewide (or in a large number of programs) or of adapting the innovation to a variety of settings.
- The quality and thoroughness of the products (according to the criteria above).
- The appropriate audience (s) for the products and the channels of communication most likely to reach them.

The CEDS staff marketing strategy recommendations for the more ambitious (and costly) dissemination efforts were reserved for products that fared exceptionally well on these criteria.

Objective 3. Identify appropriate audience for receipt of SPs.

In order to identify the appropriate audience for each of the special projects, a needs analysis questionnaire was developed in collaboration with a DPI staff member who had expertise in staff development. Assistance was also provided by the New Education Directions (NEDS) Report, a report prepared as part of an evaluation of the Division of Adult & Community Education (DPI). An external evaluator, Dr. Ed Robbins, Indiana University, also provided assistance in developing the content and format of the questionnaire. We ask such questions as, "Does the recipient know the SPs materials exist?". "Is the recipient using any of the materials?". "Can the recipient use what exists in the program?". "What personnel are available in the local

program to use or maintain the products of SPs in their program?".

The questionnaire was field tested on a limited basis. (See Appendix C). One hundred persons (primarily adult basic education teachers) were involved in the pilot testing of the questionnaire. The director of the ABE resource center in Indianapolis assisted with this phase of the project. She administered the questionnaire at local workshops conducted in the area.

RESULTS: Objective partially accomplished. The results of administering the needs analysis questionnaire to approximately 100 ABE personnel in the Indianapolis area, did support the previous findings that dissemination was a problem for 310 special projects. Adult basic education teachers were unaware, for the most part, of the wide range of products and research reports that had been completed and were available to them for use in their program.

After a meeting with DPI staff and the consultant responsible for overseeing CEDS' progress, it was suggested that the field would be in a much more informed position to make judgments regarding the use of the 310 products after the Index was completed and distributed. The decision was thus made, in consort with DPI staff and the CEDS' field consultant, to delay further field testing until after distribution of the CEDS Index. Since CEDS is a one-year project, it is hoped that identifying appropriate audiences for receipt of SPs will be pursued so that the original purpose of CEDS, to further the dissemination of the SPs, be fulfilled.

Objective 4. Identify electronic and other resources available for use in statewide communication network.

This objective was approached by contacting experts who are knowledgeable about the various systems available within the state and through employing three computer specialists. Wide reading, interviews, and discussions within the staff and between staff and other expert opinion led to the following results:

RESULTS: The objective was accomplished. For example, throughout the course of the project the Indiana University SUVON line was used to hook up the two directors who are situated fifty miles apart. Conference calls are now possible through this facility which meant that the two directors, the project assistant, and the evaluator could meet by phone as often as needed and thus save transportation costs between the two sites and many hours of travel time. Such a telephone hookup proved to be tremendously cost effective. It demonstrated that in the future, when travel costs for ABE personnel may be even more prohibitive than is currently the case, that we may still anticipate close communication through using such statewide hookups.

Another electronic resource available is, of course, the computer. One of our two computer specialists plotted the location of over 136 microcomputers on a large wall map of Indiana. (These computers, already in place in public institutions around the state, have undoubtedly multiplied even since this report was written.) By updating this wall map regularly, it would be possible to develop a statewide network linking a good portion of Indiana. This computer specialist also gathered information about the usefulness of the programming language PASCAL in developing the software for an APPLE II.

Unexpected Outcomes

The completed projects described and analyzed in the CEDS Index underscore the breadth of topics addressed, the wealth of answers available and the scope of special projects successfully completed in the State of Indiana. That is not to say that as with any innovative or research activity, problems do not exist. The problems, in our opinion, however, do not outweigh the value of the products of 310 projects.

Efforts to collect, evaluate, identify means of dissemination for these projects did produce some unexpected outcomes. At the core of the problems seems to be the lack of viable dissemination effort. Perhaps such effort has been hampered by some of the difficulties we encountered, such as:

1) the difficulty in obtaining addresses of state employees, i.e. adult education personnel

2) difficulty in obtaining products and final reports

3) final reports that were poorly written

4) differences of intent, audience, dimension, etc., of products

5) the fact that some materials never reached such a state of production that outcomes were readily available

6) lack of personnel to disseminate the project after funding terminated

7) unavailability of training after termination of the project

8) the fact that training was generally not a condition of making the products a part of the adult basic education local program at the end of the grant

9) lack of consistent, successful evaluation as to what products would be useful to the teacher and how they should be used

10) the fact that objectives presented in final reports did not match those initially submitted in proposal

11) objectives which were often not measureable

12) titles that differed between proposal and final product.

13) original objectives that differed in ADELL (1980) from those in the final report.

14) objectives that differed in the abstract from those presented in the body of the report.

15) acronyms which did not match the title.

Personnel

Personnel for the project were kept to a minimum and selected on the basis of their abilities to accomplish assigned tasks. The co-directors of the project divided their responsibilities to facilitate efficient accomplishment. They used the Indiana University SUVON line to accomplish many hours of meeting time and thus make possible long distance collaboration. The evaluator's position was filled with an experienced evaluator. When other job responsibilities prevented his completing the task, another experienced evaluator joined the staff. The support staff, highly competent and experienced in adult basic education (with the exception of the computer specialists), enjoyed the challenge of accomplishing a large assignment on minimum budget and a minimum amount of time. All staff members, unafraid of long hours, fulfilled their assigned responsibilities as planned with minimum friction. This spirit of cooperation made it possible to assemble a variety of personalities from various fields and merge them into a successful and competent working group dedicated to completing their project on time in a creditable manner.

CONCLUSIONS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Dissemination was identified in 1980 by adult basic education directors as a problem associated with the use of 310 special products. It is no surprise that the findings of the CEDS Project confirm this problem and agree with findings of the evaluation conducted for the Division of Adult & Community Education (DPI) by New Educations Directions (NED) in 1981. Their report included the following comments. "We reviewed the current systems for identifying priorities, soliciting proposals, selecting among applicants, and managing projects. They compare favorable to standard practices. Yet, utilization of 310 products is sparse..." Project CEDS is an effort to solve this problem.

The development of the CEDS Index began with a standard format, which addressed many of the unanswered questions. Each product was reviewed for coverage of all of the topics in the outline. General evaluative comments and information which did not fit into the standard categories were reserved for the final section titled "Evaluation/External."

Local programs must decide whether to use a particular set of materials, or to adopt an innovation on the basis of local evaluations of their merits. The CEDS staff's role in this process was not to declare some projects valuable and others expendable, but rather to provide concise information for local programs to use in assessing their own needs for each product and the innovation it promotes.

Local decisions to adopt an innovation should be based on factors such as:

- The match between the innovation's objectives and the program's priorities. Or, put another way, whether the innovation is designed to solve an important problem the program is experiencing.
- Evidence that adopting the innovation would have the intended effect in that program.
- Whether the innovation would mesh with other features of the local program which are not slated for revision.
- The costs of adopting the innovation. Costs include materials, equipment, training, and staff and student time. They usually vary considerable from program to program.

Adoption of an innovation is warranted where it is feasible, where its costs are outweighed by its expected benefits, and where it is more cost-effective than alternative solutions to the same problem.

The indices abstract all available information pertinent to these judgments.

If an innovation looks promising, the index reader's next question is, "What will I get if I order a copy of this 310 project's PRODUCTS?" The Index addresses this question by describing the products' availability and contents and commenting on:

- Who is most likely to find them useful (e.g., ABE teachers).
- Their thoroughness. That is, whether they stand alone or whether additional training, development, or materials are needed in order to implement the innovation.
- Their flexibility. Must the materials be used as a complete package, or can they be applied in part? How adaptable are they?
- Their packaging. Are the products convenient? Readable? Attractive? Well-organized?

Since our findings confirm the suspicion that 310 projects have more than the usual amount of dissemination problems, the following specific conclusions, each followed by related recommendations, are offered with the hope that they may alleviate some of the problems associated with dissemination of ABE Special Projects.

Conclusion 1:

With few exceptions, the products of Indiana's 310 special grants program are widely usable. Virtually all are of acceptable quality and many are highly professional. Most address important needs common to a large number of programs and are as relevant today as when they were first solicited.

Recommendations:

- Continue to give priority to special projects likely to have a state-wide impact in areas of high state-wide priority.
- Focus and intensify efforts to disseminate the products and to diffuse the innovations developed by past, present and future 310 projects.

Conclusion 2:

Written products, particularly final reports, are often confusing and difficult to read. With persistence, we were usually able to locate the information prescribed by the index format, but it was more difficult than it ought to be.

Recommendations:

- Distinguish between compliance reports and products to be disseminated. The first should contain the information needed by DPI for accountability purposes; only a small number of copies is needed. The second should be addressed to its intended users and be free of detailed accounts of the project's procedures, problems, etc.
- Before or during grant negotiations, agree upon specifications for the final products. Consider multiple products directed to different audiences or serving different purposes. Take into account the information needs of each audience; develop an outline around the questions they would be likely to ask. Review the specifications toward the end of the project and revise them in light of the project's findings or any changes in its direction.
- Encourage grantees to organize their reports to fit their material.
- Encourage summaries, tables of contents, and concise, straightforward writing.

Conclusion 3:

Many of the products of past 310 projects are, for all practical purposes, unavailable. In spite of intense and extended efforts, the CEDS staff were unable to obtain even single copies of some of the products; locating many others was laborious. Our guess is that few members of the products' intended audiences would persist to the degree necessary to secure the products they need.

Recommendations:

- House complete sets of all 310 products in an orderly manner and in accessible places at DPI, the State Library, the resource centers, and possibly at the Baker Adult Education Center and at Indiana University.
- Budget for the printing production of a reasonable number of copies of all products during grant negotiations.
- Set aside a portion of the state's 310 allocation for second printings and other dissemination efforts for the best products of the prior year. Decisions regarding extra efforts to disseminate particularly useful products could be made late in the summer following the projects' conclusion.
- Require all future projects to produce abstracts of their findings and products, perhaps using the format of the INDEX. Distribute these to all local directors.
- Make it standard practice to submit products that merit dissemination to the ERIC System.

Conclusion 4:

310 projects' evaluations generally leave important questions unanswered: The information needs of potential adopters of innovative practices need more attention, particularly in the areas of student impact and implementation costs.

Recommendations:

- Clarify the purposes of evaluating 310 projects. Stress the importance of producing information pertaining to decisions to diffuse the innovation beyond the program where it is developed.
- Develop specifications for evaluations' purposes, audiences, and questions before or during grant negotiations. Set aside adequate funds to implement these plans.

Conclusion 5:

Productive dissemination will make possible the effective use of products of 310 projects. Training and information concerning the use of each will enhance the possibilities of extensive use of the project suitable for the particular local program.

Recommendation:

- All projects should be required to go through a review process to determine whether the products should be disseminated--and how. Otherwise the piecemeal, disorganized, time consuming process for obtaining the products of special projects will continue. If final reports are not submitted, the investigators would automatically be ruled out for funding of new grants.

Epilogue

The CEDS Project, funded for a one year period, completed all of its first year objectives either completely or as completely as could be, given the availability of products and final reports. However, since the project originally submitted objectives for a three year period, the one year grant, as with many 310 grants, did not permit full exploration of the concept as originally proposed. Dissemination of the 310 projects developed to date is not likely to take place; the future of linking adult basic education with computer technology will be delayed. The personnel dedicated to the cause will either have to find new sources of funding or dedicate themselves to the task of continuance without outside funding.

The CEDS Index is scheduled for distribution by the State Department of Public Instruction to all ABE directors in the state. However, directors are busy people and may often be uninterested or unable to transmit a full blown idea to their staff. We will have a limited number of extra copies of the index for interested parties, but again, disseminating will have to take place after the funding period is over. However, it was, and continues to be our intent to establish a statewide network which will combine the emerging fields of telecommunications, computer science, information science, data processing, video processing and other assorted technologies so that the many good ideas which have been developed may be made available widely.

The technology exists and awaits only the imagination and perseverance of the users in order to establish a communications network which can match user need with available materials. Such linkage is particularly important in adult basic education. On any given day the ABE teacher may be faced with meeting the needs of foreign students who speak little or no English and may indeed be illiterate in their own language; of providing material for the native speaker who has no background in reading and writing; or of helping the GED prep student with math or science requirements. We seldom ask this of teachers in regular classrooms. For the ABE teacher it is standard fare. Such teachers desperately need a system which can

link them with the wide variety of resources available. That system must be able to provide services quickly and at minimum cost.

Eventually, a computer retrieval system can be built which will sort through a wide range of data bases in the humanities, and social, life, health and physical sciences to provide a computer print-out tailor-made to the ABE teacher's or administrator's specifications. Such a system will allow the freedom to work specifically with the needs of the learner rather than being limited by the lack of materials. Telecommunications will dramatically affect the way we work, play, learn, and govern our ABE instruction.

The ADELL catalog was a pioneer effort to establish a national listing of 310 projects. The CEDS Index goes beyond ADELL in that it assesses the products and recommends next steps for distribution. The CEDS model can be a valuable guide for other states.

With all of the limitations of which we are acutely aware, we still believe that Indiana has done as much as many, and more than most states, in implementing the spirit of the 310 provision. But development alone will not do the trick. We must now get these products out to the practitioner. Some may warrant wide dissemination. Some are too expensive or inappropriate for dissemination. Ideas behind even the expensive or inappropriate projects should be shared. Local users will at least know the idea exists, and can then adapt/adopt the ideas. Therefore, we would strongly encourage:

a. researchers to continue to study some of the questions raised by Indiana 310 research to date. For example, it would be unfortunate if transportation or child care for ABE students were dismissed on the strength of the studies conducted to date with 310 funds. Policy should not be made as the result of one study. Many studies will assist in the development of wise policies. Build on the research that has begun by these innovative and fact-finding projects.

b. teachers to find a knowledgeable person to talk to about a project. See these products. Ask for funds from the state to provide in-service workshops by the developers. Try the ideas. Add to them. Adapt them.

c. teacher-trainers to feel free to call developers for ideas or assistance. Many would be very happy to share time discussing their favorite development project.

d. resource centers to create a file of any and all ERIC microfiche that pertain to adult basic education, ABE/ESL, and vocational topics. Have on hand one microfiche reader per center. See to it that Indiana's 310 projects are available for use as appropriate. (Appendix D).

e. DPI to assume the responsibility for updating the CEDS Index--either using their own personnel, delegating the responsibility to capable, impartial adult education personnel, or perhaps by using a portion of the 310 monies to accomplish the task...and requiring those special project directors to complete an index entry in the CEDS format. Now that the usable format has been developed the bulk of the writeups for past projects should not be so difficult to do providing it is done regularly. Along with the directive to research and develop must go the support mechanism which actualizes the potential of such effort. There must be some system where-by these products can be readily available.

APPENDIX A-1

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION

OF

SPECIAL PROJECTS

2nd revision
12/10/81

COLLECTION, EVALUATION, DISSEMINATION SYSTEM (CEDS)

Directions: For each of the criteria below, circle the number -- one - seven -- that reflects your assessment of the extent to which the project meets the criteria.

I INTENT (The extent to which the purpose is clear)

Clear						Unclear
7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Purpose stated in clear, explicit terms	Purpose stated in general terms	Purpose not stated but is implied through other project information	Purpose not stated and must be assumed		Purpose not stated, and no information from which purpose may be assumed	

II Efficacy (The extent to which the purpose is accomplished)

High						Low
7	6	5	4	3	2	1
Emperical evidence that project accomplishes intended purpose	Emperical evidence from similar projects indicates that project can meet intended purpose	Common sense indicates that project should meet intended purposes	Evidence indicates project not likely to meet intended purposes		Evidence indicates project did not meet intended purposes	

III Efficiency (The extent to which the potential accomplishments are worth the costs)

Good 7	6	5	4	3	2	Poor 1
Permits productive use of resources		No information on which to base cost effectiveness				Requires unproductive use of resources

IV Adaptability (The extent to which it can be used as is by others).

High 7	6	5	4	3	2	Low 1
Can be used as is in a wide range of situations	Can be used as is in selected situations	No evidence concerning use as is in other situations		Can be used as is only in situations very similar to the one in which it was developed		Can be used only in the situation where it was developed

V Adaptability (The extent to which it can be modified to fit other situations).

High 7	6	5	4	3	2	Low 1
Can be modified to fit a wide range of other situations	Can be modified to fit selected situations	No evidence concerning extent to which it may be modified		Unlikely that it can be modified to fit other situations		Cannot be modified

DB 3/26/82
CEDS

APPENDIX A-2

Proposed Worksheet

for Evaluating 310 Products

1. Product. Identify what was actually left behind - e.g., information, models, recommendations, or materials for use in___. This is to clarify that we're evaluating the merit of disseminating the product, NOT the original project's benefits to its participants.

2. Need: form of. Check the type(s) of needs the product addresses.

___Encourages students to participate in AE.
___Expands needy populations' access to basic education.
___Expands services to clientele.
___Contributes to staff productivity or effectiveness.
___Contributes to effective program management or planning.
Comments:

3. Need: Breadth of applicability. List qualifiers on which programs could use the product - e. g., ESL only. Later we might try to estimate the number of programs meeting the qualifiers.

4. Need: Intensity. Given that a program meets any qualifiers above, how intense is the need addressed by the product?

marginal - 1 2 3 4 5 - critical

Remarks:

5. Availability of Alternatives. Does the product have competitors which address the same need?

___Yes, better ones
___Yes, but they're less desirable
___No. We know of nothing else that accomplishes the same thing.

6. Readiness for implementation/use: Check all that apply.

___Product stands alone and is thorough enough for use for program replication.

___Useful alone but leaves important questions unanswered.

___Of little or no practical use alone.

___Substantial development still necessary locally.

___Training necessary.

Remarks:

7. Evidence of product effectiveness

___Compelling

___Promising

___Big holes

___None

___Indicates ineffectiveness

8. Packaging. Rate each on 1-5 scale, 5 high.

___Readability

___Attractiveness

___Convenience

9. Costs of purchase and implementation

___Lover than standard practise

___Competitive with standard practice

___Higher than standard practice

___Justifiable

___Prohibitive

___Indeterminate

10. All things considered, we recommend:

___Strong dissemination efforts

___Promoting awareness of availability

___Passive distribution

___Burning every remaining copy and any other record that we ever spent tax dollars that way.

APPENDIX A-3

PROJECT # _____

TITLE _____

Working Draft
CEDS Evaluation
4/21/82

CRITERIA FOR THE EVALUATION
OF
SPECIAL PROJECTS
FOR
COLLECTION, EVALUATION, DISSEMINATION SYSTEM (CEDS)

DIRECTIONS: For each of the criteria below, circle the number-- one to seven --that reflects your assessment of the extent to which the products meet the criteria. Evaluate products, rather than original project's benefits to its participants.

I. INTENT (The extent to which the purpose is clear)

Clear 7	6	5	4	3	2	Unclear 1
Purpose stated in clear, explicit terms		Purpose stated in general terms	Purpose not stated but is implied through other project information	Purpose not stated and must be assumed		Purpose not stated, and no information from which purpose may be assumed

Comments _____

_____

_____

II. EFFICACY (The extent to which the purpose is accomplished)

High 7	6	5	4	3	2	Low 1
Empirical evidence that project accomplishes intended purpose		Empirical evidence from similar projects indicates that project can meet intended purpose	Common sense indicates that project should meet intended purposes	Evidence indicates project not likely to meet intended purposes		Evidence indicates project did not meet intended purposes

Comments _____

_____

_____

III. EFFICIENCY (The extent to which the potential accomplishments are worth the costs)

Good 7	6	5	4	3	2	Poor 1
Permits productive use of resources					Requires unproductive use of resources	

No information on which to base cost effectiveness _____

Comments _____

_____

_____

PROJECT # _____

Working Draft
CEDS Evaluation
4/21/82

IV. ADOPTABILITY (The extent to which it can be used as is by others)

High 7	6	5	4	3	2	Low 1
Can be used as is in a wide range of situations		Can be used as is in selected situations		Can be used as is only in situations very similar to the one in which it was developed	Can be used only in the situation where it was developed	

No evidence concerning use as is in other situations _____

Comments _____

V. ADAPTABILITY (The extent to which it can be modified to fit other situations)

High 7	6	5	4	3	2	Low 1
Can be modified to fit a wide range of other situations		Can be modified to fit selected situations		Unlikely that it can be modified to fit other situations	Cannot be modified	

No evidence concerning extent to which it may be modified _____

Comments _____

SUMMARY STATEMENT _____

Evaluator _____

APPENDIX B

SPECIAL PROJECTS 1978 - 1981

A	RECORD KEEPING	Ronald D. Baker	Bloomington
B	CONSUMER MATH	Patricia Campbell	West Lafayette
C	ABE READING PROG.	LaVon Coate	Vincennes
D	RECRUITMENT/RETENTION	Mike Dean	Indianapolis
E	PRE-SERVICE TRAINING	Esref Delalic	Kabal, Afghanistan
F	HISPANIC VOC INT TEST	Gerald O. Dudley	South Bend
G	VOICE	Gerald O. Dudley	South Bend
H	HELP	Wanda Fuhry	New Albany
I	ESL/ABE (APPLY NOW)	Alan Garfinkel	West Lafayette
J	RIDE TO READ	Wm. Henry	Kokomo
K	CHILD CARE	Vickie Hobbs	Shelbyville
L	DECIDE	Ruth Huffman	Indianapolis
M	EXTERNAL DIPLOMA	Rollin E. Jump	Indianapolis
N	CUBE	Ann McDermott	Bloomington
O	LVA	Dora McQuade	Syracuse, New York
P	FOCUS ON CHOICE	Harriet Miller	Fort Wayne
Q	SEARCH	Sue A. Miller	Indianapolis
R	MATH DIAG & PLACEMENT	Ellen Mize	Vincennes
S	JOB SPECIFIC LITERACY	Alden J. Moe	West Lafayette
T	LIT-TV	Michael S. Parer	Bloomington
U	LD	Michael S. Parer	Bloomington
V	CAREER DOORS	Monica Pugh	Fort Wayne
W	UNMET NEEDS	Edwin Russell	Portage
X	ESL	Timmie Steinbruegge	Indianapolis

APPENDIX C

Special Projects Questionnaire

1. With which of the special projects are you familiar? (Circle the numbers of those projects -- see attached list).

1	4	7	10	13	16	19	22
2	5	8	11	14	17	20	23
3	6	9	12	15	18	21	24

2. Which of the special projects have you used in the past. (Circle the numbers of all those projects you have used in the past).

1	4	7	10	13	16	19	22
2	5	8	11	14	17	20	23
3	6	9	12	15	18	21	24

3. Which of the special projects are you now using? (Circle the numbers of all projects you are now using).

1	4	7	10	13	16	19	22
2	5	8	11	14	17	20	23
3	6	9	12	15	18	21	24

4. How competent did you feel in your use of the special projects? (For each of the special projects you circled for questions 1, 2 and 3 above, indicate how competent you feel you were, are, or would be to use the project. In the blank beside each project number circled in the questions above, place a number from 1 to 5 to indicate how competent you feel you are to use the project. Use the scale below to guide your responses.

Not Competent — Highly Competent

7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Unable to Use	Somewhat Able to Use	Extremely Able to Use
I feel unqualified to use the project	I feel somewhat qualified to use this project, but could use more experience or training.	I feel very qualified and capable to use the project

1._____	7._____	13._____	19._____
2._____	8._____	14._____	20._____
3._____	9._____	15._____	21._____
4._____	10._____	16._____	22.__ __
5._____	11._____	17._____	23._____
6._____	12._____	18._____	24._____

Rev. 2/8/82

5. Would you be interested in receiving training to acquaint you with the special projects? (Check the one statement below that most accurately reflects your response).

_____I am interested in training to learn about the special projects.

_____I am interested in training to improve my ability to use the special projects.

_____I am interested in training to both learn about, and how to use the special projects.

_____I am not interested in receiving training related tothe special projects at this time.

_____I am not interested in receiving training now, but would be interested at a later date.

_____ Does not apply.

HUNTER/HARMON have chacterized the ABE learner. Listed below are the major characteristics emphasized in their study.

6. Using the numbers 4 - 3 - 2 - 1, identify your students, with the #4 representing the largest catagory of students in your classroom and on a descending scale #1 would represent the least number of students in your classroom.

Group #1 students _____

- secure, self directed
- respond well to group activities as well as individual instruction
- open to recruitment through the media

Group #2 students _____

- persons less economically and personally secure
- often have large families and seasonal jobs who must often work overtime
- have suffered consequences of undereducation and under employment
- are eager learners, capable of achieving specific goals

Group #3 students_____

- sporadically employed in low paying, short term jobs

Group #4 students_____

- the stationery poor - require one-to-one instruction

SPECIAL PROJECTS 1978 - 1981

1.UNMET NEEDS OF STUDENTS	Russell, Portage
2.HELP	Fury, New Albany
3.DECIDE	Huffman,Indy
4.EXTERNAL DIPLOMA	Jump, Indy
5.RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION MOD.	Dean, Indy
6.VOC.ORIENTATION FOR INDIV. COUNS. EVALUATION	Dudley, S. Bend
7.Adapt.Voc.Int.Tests for Hisp.	Dudley, S.Bend
8.Task-Orientation Mat. for ABE -APPLY NOW -ESL	Garfinkel, Purdue
9.Focus on Choice	Miller, Ft. Wayne
10.Model for ABE Ed. Prov. Counseling Services	Miller (Villegas)
11.Career Doors	Pugh, Ft. Wayne
12.Eval/Diss.of Inst. Models for Consumer Arith/Prob.Solving	Campbell, Purdue
13.Math Diagnostic and Placement Kit	Mize, Vincennes U.
14.Model Record Keeping System & Dissem.of & Inst. in Model Record Keeping System	Baker, Bloomington
15.ABE Teacher/Learning Mgmt.Syst.	McDermott, Bloomington
16.LVA of Indiana	McQuade, Indy.
17.Ident.of Job Related Lit.Req. Prep/Diss of Job Spec.Lit.Skills Dvl.Mtrls	Moe, Purdue
18.Lit-TV(Lit. Inst. Training)	Newman/Parer,Bloomington
19.Learning Disabled Mat.for ABE	Parer, Bloomington
20.ESL Teacher Training Handbook-Diss.of ESL Teacher Train.Handbook	Stienbruege, Indy.
21.Pre-Service Training for ABE Teachers	Delalic, Jasper
22.Adult Ed. Reading Program	LaVon Coate,Vincennes
23.Ride to Read	Henry, Kokomo
24.Two Alternatives for providing Child Care Services for ABE Stud.	Hobbs, Shelbyville

APPENDIX D
ABE SITES IN INDIANA